



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

THE ETHIOPIC TEXT OF ENOCH.

II.

Libri Enoch Versio Æthiopica, Oxoniae, 1838. LAURENCE.

Libri Henoch, Æthiopice, ad quinque codicum fidem editus, cum varis lectionibus. Lipsiae, 1851, DILLMANN.

Ueber den neugefundenen griechischen Text des Henoch-Buches (Sitzungsberichte d. kgl. Preuss. Akad. d. Wiss. zu Berlin, 1892, li.-liiii., pp. 1039-54 ; 1079-92), DILLMANN.

THE first of the above-mentioned works we may safely ignore, as it is based on a single MS., and that, moreover, a MS. which belongs to a later and corrupt type of text. The value of Laurence's book is further lessened by its not unfrequent typographical errors.

The edition of Professor Dillmann, however, is one of a very different character. Five MSS. have been used in the formation of the text here adopted. The first of these MSS., which Dillmann designates A, was that used by Laurence ; the second = B as well as the former belongs to the Bodleian Library ; the third = C is to be found in the Frankfort Library, and the remaining two, D and E, were lent to Dillmann by Mr. Robert Curzon.

On page 2 of the "Annotations" on this book Dillmann is disinclined to believe in any notable corruption of the Ethiopic text, and attributes such perversions of this text as may be found, not to an Ethiopic source, but to the corruptions already existing in the Greek MS. which the translator used, or to misconceptions of the translator. Further, we find it stated by this scholar that these MSS. present one and the same type of text, and that the signs of various recensions are conspicuous by their absence. This edition and the views it propounded seemed to have been generally accepted till within a few months ago. Like other students of Ethiopic and Apocalypse I had taken them on trust ; for to one who had learnt the first rudiments of these studies through the works of this distinguished scholar, and had found in these works the only possible means for further progress, it seemed at first a heresy to cast any doubt, however slight, on the *ex cathedra* statements of this great Master of Semitic learning. But the pupil who has imbibed the spirit of his teacher cannot long remain in this unhealthy frame of mind, and, accordingly, as far back as two years ago I became convinced of the unsatisfactory nature of Dr. Dillmann's Edition of Enoch, and cast about for materials for the formation of a better text. My quest was speedily rewarded. I came across nine MSS. hitherto uncollated, and soon found on examination that two of these, which I will designate G and M, were of inestimable value. By the

aid of these MSS., together with the Syncellus and Mai Greek fragments, I was enabled to arrive at a type of text immeasurably purer and earlier than that which appears in Dillmann's text, and thus I was obliged to meet his statements as given above with a direct and unhesitating negative. I gave the first indication of these facts in the *Expository Times* of November 1891, but it was not till recently that I plainly expressed myself in the *Academy* of November 26th, 1892. It is not necessary to pursue this question at any length, as Dr. Dillmann has since amply admitted all my contentions (see *Sitzungsberichte d. kgl. Preuss. Akad. d. Wiss. zu Berlin*, Dec. 1892, pp. 1039-54 ; 1079-1092). In these articles Dillmann enters on the criticism and emendation of the Ethiopic and Greek text, and bases many of his new readings on two new MSS. These MSS., however, appear to fail him in some crucial instances where G and G M are more than satisfactory. I have remarked that in x. 10, xxviii. 1 they are guilty of omitting phrases which are well attested by the Gizeh Greek and the MSS. I use : also that they agree with the later and corrupt text in xx. 2, as well as in i. 7 : xiv. 22, 23 ; xvii. 3, 10, and so render emendation necessary. They are, however, of a very superior type to A B C D E, on which the published Ethiopic text is based, and appear, so far as it is possible to estimate their value through the limited number of their readings given in Dr. Dillmann's articles, to occupy a position closely adjoining G¹ and M, and midway between G and A B C D E, though rather nearer the former than the latter. I have examined seven other MSS., F H I K L N O, on about three hundred readings, and find that they are more conservative of the ancient and uncorrupt text than A B C D E, but yet belong in the main to the later and corrupt type of text. It is worthy of remark that these twelve MSS. just cited agree in presenting a *vox nulla* on xcvi. 2, of which there is not a trace in G G¹ M. This phenomenon would in itself point to one and the same recension or ancestry.

We must turn now from the question of Ethiopic MSS. to Dillmann's Ethiopic text, and we will deal first with the latter and unrevised portion, *i.e.*, xxxiii.-cviii. That these chapters present a corrupt and untrustworthy form of the text is clear on the following grounds:—

i. *There are omissions of undoubtedly integral parts of the text.*—Cf. xxxix. 7, where the clause “and uprightness never faileth before him,” though attested by C E F G H L M N O, is omitted. Clauses are also omitted in lxxvii. 3 against A C E F G H I K M N, and in xc. 6 against F H I L M N O.

ii. *Corrupt readings are given in the face of overwhelming MS. evidence.* On liii. 7, A D E F G H K L M N O are against Dillmann's

text; on lxii. 15, 16, whilst G I M N present the best text, which varies considerably from Dlm.'s, and F H L O offer many variants, Dlm.'s MSS. agree in being monotonously bad, and their almost complete freedom from variants points to a late recension; on lxix. 17, Dlm.'s text presents a corrupt reading against A E F G H I M N; on xc. 18 against B C D F G H I L M N O; on xc. 19, against A E F G H I L M N O; on xciii. 10, against A (C) E F G H I M N; on cii. 4, against C F G G¹ H I L M N.

iii. *Corrupt readings are given against unquestionably better readings and sense.*—For *wats'u*, "gone forth," we should read with G *nad'u* "completed," on lxvii. 2; on lxvii. 8 we should omit "soul and" with G; for "minister to the healing of the angels and to the death of their body" we should read with G, supported in the main by M, "minister to the healing of the body of the kings and to the lust of their body." Here I have read with Halévi "kings" for "angels," which were confused by the Greek translator; on lxx. 3 read *tuhasabku*, "I was numbered," with G, instead of *tashebku*, "I was dragged." In a similar way corrupt and senseless readings are to be replaced by ancient and significant readings in lxxiii. 5-8; lxxxii. 11; lxxxv. 3; lxxxix. 1; cii. 10; civ. 5; cviii. 12.

iv. *Corrupt readings are given against readings of G or G¹, supported by external Greek or Latin testimony.*—On lxxxix. 42 Dlm. gives "till another sheep, the Lord of the sheep arose," whereas G gives "till the Lord of the sheep raised up another sheep," and so Greek μέχρι οὗ ἤγειρεν ὁ κύριος τῶν προβάτων κριὸν ἑνα; on xcix. 7, for "in the idol temples" we should read "not according to knowledge," with G¹ (G) and Tertullian, *De Idol.* iv. "non secundum scientiam"; on cii. 3, for "He that is great in glory" we should read "the Great Glory," with G G¹ M. So xiv. 20 in Ethiopic and Gizeh Greek.

v. *Corrupt readings are given in this text which misrepresent the doctrine of the book, or affect its interpretation and date.*—On lxii. 5, for "the son of the woman," we should read with G "the Son of Man." On lxii. 6; lxiii. 2, 12; lxvii. 8, for "the mighty kings" we should read with G M and some other MSS. "the kings and the mighty." In lv. 4 even G gives "the mighty kings," but the text must be corrupt there. The question at issue here is that whereas the later Asmoneans could not reasonably be called "the mighty kings," they could rightly be designated "the kings and the mighty." On xci. 15 for "The eternal judgment which is held over the watchers, and the great eternal heaven which springs from amongst the angels," we should read with G M "The eternal judgment, in which He will execute vengeance amongst the angels."

We have now dealt at sufficient length with xxxiii.-cviii. Let

us now turn to the criticism of i.-xxxii., which have been revised and emended in the numbers of the *Sitzungsberichte* above referred to. In these chapters Dlm. makes about one hundred changes, but these, even if they could in every case be substantiated, are far from sufficient to clear his text from corruptions. His emendations are, of course, in the main right, as they are based either on Ethiopic MS. evidence, or the testimony of the Syncellus or Gizeh Greek fragments. Some, also, of these emendations are most happy, though by no means obvious at first sight. My purpose, however, is not to dwell on the improvements thus recently made in the text, but rather to take objection to some of the proposed emendations, and likewise to draw attention to the numerous corruptions that still remain.

In ix. 6 the Gizeh Greek reads ἀ ἐπιτηδεύοντες ἔγνωσαν ἄνθρωποι. The first two of these words have been omitted by the Eth., and Dlm. says that the last two are also omitted. But this is not so. They lie hidden under the corrupt phrase *Amara* : *Sebatâta*, which should be read *A^amara* : *Sab^a* = ἔγνωσαν ἄνθρωποι. These words have got wrongly connected with the next verse in the Eth.

In ix. 8 he declares *hebûra* to be the survival of *medr* = τῆς γῆς in the Greek Text. But, in the first place, *hebûra* is not found in the best MSS., and the equivalent of τῆς γῆς is still preserved in the Eth. under the corruption *badîba* : *sab^a*, for which we should read *badîbu* : *jabs* = ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς.

In xiv. 18 Dlm. emends *opas* χερουβιν, which we find in the Gizeh MS. over against *Qîla* : *Kîrûbêl*, into *ôpas* χερ. But if this were in the right direction we should require *ôpâsews*. It can hardly be right, however, as it fails to give any explanation of the Eth. reading *Qîla*, which implies *ôpôs* = "voice." But "the voice of Cherubim" does not give the right sense. Hence *opas* and *ôpôs* point to the parent reading of both, i.e. ὄψεως, "the vision of Cherubim."

In xxi. 2 he says that *natserô* : *ajnú* is an inaccurate rendering of *εἰκάσαι* in Gizeh Greek; but *ajnú* is simply a wrong vocalisation of *ajnô* = *εἰκάσαι*, and *natsero* has been wrongly repeated from the preceding clause owing to this corruption.

In xxii. 2 he says that *kama* : *lemûts* *Zajânkuârakuer* is a gloss on the preceding *lemûts*. This is not so. It is an inexact rendering of πῶς λεία τὰ κοιλώματα in the Gizeh Greek.

In xxx. 2 he proposes *χρεία* for *χρόα* in the Gizeh Greek, but *χρόα* is attested by the text of G M *zaj^amasl*.

If we turn now to the corruptions that are still left untouched, we might among others adduce i. 9, where *rasaju* should be amended into *rasêû* : ix. 8, where for *sab^a* we should read *jabs* : xiv. 2 where for *bamanfasja* : *zanahaba* : *abij* : *afu* we must read *bamanfusa* : *afâju* : *zu^a* : *u^a*. There are corruptions also in the following passages which

clearly call for emendation, but have received no treatment : xiv. 2, 20, 22—33 ; xx. 2, 6 ; xxi. 5 ; xxii. 9 ; xxiii. 4 ; xxvii. 5 ; xxviii. 2 ; xxxi. 2.

It might appear from the above criticism that the Ethiopic text must compare very unfavourably with that preserved in the Gizeh MS. But this is by no means the case ; and herein I can agree heartily with Prof. Dillmann, my master in these studies. From an exhaustive comparison of the two texts, I have arrived at the following conclusion, that *the Ethiopic preserves a more ancient and trustworthy form of text than the Gizeh MS. ; that it has fewer additions, fewer omissions, and fewer and less serious corruptions than that text.* This conclusion I hope to substantiate at some length in my work on Enoch, which will appear in May.

This result, in conclusion, is in perfect harmony with the external history of the Gizeh Greek text and the Eth. version. The former cannot be earlier than the eighth century, and may be as late as the twelfth. It is possible, therefore, that it is a descendant of the third or still remoter degree from the common Greek parent of the two texts. This of itself would account for some of the corruptions ; but the real explanation of its vicious orthography and syntax and of its very numerous and serious corruptions is that the Book of Enoch was from the fifth century onward practically a proscribed book, and under the ban of the Greek and Latin Churches. Accordingly, it was copied without care, and the way was opened for every kind of depravation of the text. The Eth. version (circ. 500 A.D.), on the other hand, was, so far as we know, regarded from the first as a canonical book of the Old Testament in the Ethiopic Church, and thus it was transmitted with the greatest care and accuracy through successive copies till the sixteenth century. After this date the text suffered much from ignorant corrections.

R. H. CHARLES.

Beiträge zur Geschichte der Bibelexegese. Heft 1 des Gregorius Abul-farag, gen. Bar-Hebräus, Scholien zum Buche Daniel. Herausgegeben, übersetzt und mit Anmerkungen versehen, von Dr. JACOB FREIMANN. Brünn, 1892. Epstein & Co., pp. 74.

Zur Geschichte der Exegese. Inaugural-Dissertation zur Erlangung der Philos. Doctorwürde, etc., von IMMANUEL PLATO. Halle, 1892, pp. 54.

THE two little books form a welcome contribution to the history of Biblical exegesis, although they refer to the comparatively late period of the 13th and 14th centuries. These two men were even to some